



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/540,839

06/27/2005

Masanori Abe

Q88793

8993

65565

7590

09/03/2008

SUGHRUE-265550

2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. NW

WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

MILLER, DANIEL H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1794

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/03/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/540,839 | Applicant(s) ABE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner DANIEL MILLER | Art Unit 1794 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DANIEL MILLER. (3) ____.

(2) Peter Olexy. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 29 August 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: All claims were generically discussed.

Identification of prior art discussed: The art of record was discussed generally.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant had submitted a suggested amendment as well as topics of discussion for the interview. One of applicant's proposed amendment to a plasma treatment device appears to be intended use language that does not necessarily distinguish over the prior art. All of the proposed amendments would necessitate a new search. No agreement was reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|--|--|
| /Daniel Miller/ Examiner, Art Unit 1794 | /KEITH D. HENDRICKS/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794 |
|--|--|